



May 28, 1996

WHERE THE NEWS COMES FIRST

Dennis Williamson
President/General Manager

RECEIVED
JUN - 3 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

The Honorable Reed E. Hundt, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 814
Washington, D.C. 20054

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FAX (202) 418-2804
RE: MM Docket 95-92

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear Chairman Hundt:

I am writing to express my view on the proposed changes in the FCC's network-affiliate rules and, specifically, the "right to reject" rule. I understand that this rule is proposed to be modified to allow the networks to enter into agreements with affiliates to eliminate "economic" preemptions. I am steadfastly opposed to this proposed modification.

The "right to reject" rule, as currently written, protects my right to program in the best interest of my community. As an example, we have an Agreement with the Portland Trail Blazers to broadcast 20 regular season NBA basketball games. These are among the highest rated programs we offer all year. We do receive compensation from the Trail Blazers for airing these games. If my network is allowed to focus on this compensation alone, they could argue that these games constitute an "economic" preemption and would bring pressure to bear to force me to discontinue airing these popular games. The determination of whether a preemption is "economic" cannot be made objectively. The networks will be motivated to view each preemption as "economic" and ignore the public interest.

The network-affiliate relationship is both a partnership and is, at times, adversarial. The local affiliate is concerned with serving the interests of the local community in which it is licensed to serve. We do this through both local and network programming. The networks, on the other hand, are concerned only with the carriage of its national programming service. If the networks are allowed to pressure their local affiliates against preemptions, the balance of power in the network-affiliate relationship will shift inescapably to the network and would be tantamount to giving the network control over the internal affairs of its affiliates.

I respectfully request that the "right to reject" rule remain in place, as it is currently written.

Respectfully yours,

Dennis Williamson

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____





May 28, 1996

RECEIVED
JUN - 3 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

Dennis Williamson
President/General Manager

The Honorable Susan Ness, Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 832
Washington, D.C. 20054

FAX (202) 418-2821
RE: MM Docket 95-92

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Ness:

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

I am writing to express my view on the proposed changes in the FCC's network-affiliate rules and, specifically, the "right to reject" rule. I understand that this rule is proposed to be modified to allow the networks to enter into agreements with affiliates to eliminate "economic" preemptions. I am steadfastly opposed to this proposed modification.

The "right to reject" rule, as currently written, protects my right to program in the best interest of my community. As an example, we have an Agreement with the Portland Trail Blazer's to broadcast 20 regular season NBA basketball games. These are among the highest rated programs we offer all year. We do receive compensation from the Trail Blazers for airing these games. If my network is allowed to focus on this compensation alone, they could argue that these games constitute an "economic" preemption and would bring pressure to bear to force me to discontinue airing these popular games. The determination of whether a preemption is "economic" cannot be made objectively. The networks will be motivated to view each preemption as "economic" and ignore the public interest.

The network-affiliate relationship is both a partnership and is, at times, adversarial. The local affiliate is concerned with serving the interests of the local community in which it is licensed to serve. We do this through both local and network programming. The networks, on the other hand, are concerned only with the carriage of its national programming service. If the networks are allowed to pressure their local affiliates against preemptions, the balance of power in the network-affiliate relationship will shift inescapably to the network and would be tantamount to giving the network control over the internal affairs of its affiliates.

I respectfully request that the "right to reject" rule remain in place, as it is currently written.

Respectfully yours,

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE



May 28, 1996

RECEIVED
JUN - 3 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

Dennis Williamson
President/General Manager

The Honorable Rachelle B. Chong, Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 844
Washington, D.C. 20054

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FAX (202) 418-2820
RE: MM Docket 95-92

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear Commissioner Chong:

I am writing to express my view on the proposed changes in the FCC's network-affiliate rules and, specifically, the "right to reject" rule. I understand that this rule is proposed to be modified to allow the networks to enter into agreements with affiliates to eliminate "economic" preemptions. I am steadfastly opposed to this proposed modification.

The "right to reject" rule, as currently written, protects my right to program in the best interest of my community. As an example, we have an Agreement with the Portland Trail Blazers to broadcast 20 regular season NBA basketball games. These are among the highest rated programs we offer all year. We do receive compensation from the Trail Blazers for airing these games. If my network is allowed to focus on this compensation alone, they could argue that these games constitute an "economic" preemption and would bring pressure to bear to force me to discontinue airing these popular games. The determination of whether a preemption is "economic" cannot be made objectively. The networks will be motivated to view each preemption as "economic" and ignore the public interest.

The network-affiliate relationship is both a partnership and is, at times, adversarial. The local affiliate is concerned with serving the interests of the local community in which it is licensed to serve. We do this through both local and network programming. The networks, on the other hand, are concerned only with the carriage of its national programming service. If the networks are allowed to pressure their local affiliates against preemptions, the balance of power in the network-affiliate relationship will shift inescapably to the network and would be tantamount to giving the network control over the internal affairs of its affiliates.

I respectfully request that the "right to reject" rule remain in place, as it is currently written.

Respectfully yours,

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE



May 28, 1996

RECEIVED
JUN - 3 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

Dennis Williamson
President/General Manager

The Honorable James H. Quello, Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 802
Washington, D.C. 20054

FAX (202) 418-2802
RE: MM Docket 95-92

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear Commissioner Quello:

I am writing to express my view on the proposed changes in the FCC's network-affiliate rules and, specifically, the "right to reject" rule. I understand that this rule is proposed to be modified to allow the networks to enter into agreements with affiliates to eliminate "economic" preemptions. I am steadfastly opposed to this proposed modification.

The "right to reject" rule, as currently written, protects my right to program in the best interest of my community. As an example, we have an Agreement with the Portland Trail Blazers to broadcast 20 regular season NBA basketball games. These are among the highest rated programs we offer all year. We do receive compensation from the Trail Blazers for airing these games. If my network is allowed to focus on this compensation alone, they could argue that these games constitute an "economic" preemption and would bring pressure to bear to force me to discontinue airing these popular games. The determination of whether a preemption is "economic" cannot be made objectively. The networks will be motivated to view each preemption as "economic" and ignore the public interest.

The network-affiliate relationship is both a partnership and is, at times, adversarial. The local affiliate is concerned with serving the interests of the local community in which it is licensed to serve. We do this through both local and network programming. The networks, on the other hand, are concerned only with the carriage of its national programming service. If the networks are allowed to pressure their local affiliates against preemptions, the balance of power in the network-affiliate relationship will shift inescapably to the network and would be tantamount to giving the network control over the internal affairs of its affiliates.

I respectfully request that the "right to reject" rule remain in place, as it is currently written.

Respectfully yours,

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE